LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.



IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1962

No. 227

DAVID WASSERMANN,

Petitioner,

against

THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE APPELLATE DIVISION, THIRD DEPARTMENT, OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

JACOB RASSNER,
Counsel for Petitioner,
Office & P. O. Address,
15 Park Row,
New York 38, N. Y.

INDEX

	PAGE
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Questions Presented	3
Laws Involved	4
Statement	4
Reasons for Granting the Writ	9
Summary of the Argument	10
ARGUMENT:	
POINT I—This Court has repeatedly stated that it will not be foreclosed to make inquiry, irrespective of the State Court findings that constitutional questions were or were not raised or passed on	12
POINT II—Supreme Court makes its own inquiry as to facts of denial of due process	13
POINT III—Petitioner was denied the equal protection of the laws in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. The failure to redress constitutes error	14
POINT IV—Petitioner has been deprived of a valuable property without due process of law	16
POINT V—Petitioner was deprived of due process in that he did not have a fair hearing	16
A. Adequate Notice	17
B. Impartial Tribunal	18
C. Petitioner Was Deprived of Due Process as His Hearing Was Not Held by a Competent Tribunal	20

PAGE

D. Petitioner Was Deprived of Due Process in That He Was Deprived of the Right of Confrontation and Cross-Examination 23

E. Petitioner's Right to Due Process Was Violated by an Industry Body of Unpaid Private Citizens Performing a Public and Judicial Function of Holding the Hearing Resulting in Revocation of His License 24

F. Petitioner Was Deprived of Due Process in That Acts Charged Against Petitioner Were Not Set Forth, Defined or Contained in Statutes Charged 26

G. Petitioner Was Deprived of Due Process in That He Was Found Guilty of Acts Not Charged Against Him 28

H. Petitioner Was Deprived of Due Process by the Finding of Guilt Based on Hearsay and Not Supported by Evidence of Probative Value 29

I. Petitioner is Deprived of Due Process in That Punitive or Penal and Disciplinary Status Was Enforced Against Him Retroactively and *Ex Post Facto* 29

J. Petitioner Was Deprived of Due Process by Respondent's Use of False Exhibit as Evidence, in Lieu of Original Exhibit 30

K. Due Process is Lacking Where, as Here, the One Who Decides Did Not Hear the Evidence 32

POINT VI—Petitioner has been deprived of due process, as due process requires that police power, penal and/or disciplinary statutes must be strictly construed 33

PAGE

POINT VII—Petitioner was deprived of due process in that lack of an adequate or intelligible standard in 2(a) and 2(g) renders them void and violative of due process 38

POINT VIII—Petitioner was deprived of due process in that the delegation of unfettered discretion to respondent in the pertinent provisions of § 6515 is contrary to constitutional requirements of due process and the subject provisions are, therefore, constitutionally void 40

POINT IX—Petitioner was deprived of due process in that Education Law § 211 is an unconstitutional delegation of unfettered discretion to the respondent to make an arbitrary determination, regardless of the evidence, and such provision is unconstitutional and void 42

POINT X—Petitioner was deprived of due process in that the respondent's Committee on Grievances was not properly constituted in accordance with the provisions of subdivisions 1 and 4 of § 6515, and these proceedings were, therefore, void, resulting in lack of due process in the revocation of petitioner's license 43

POINT XI—Petitioner's constitutional rights were violated when he was compelled to testify against himself and was deprived of the aid of counsel 47

He Was Not Informed That He Was a Prospective Defendant 47

POINT XII—Respondent's sub-committee found petitioner guilty on inconsistent and conflicting findings of fact which establish innocence, not guilt 48

CONCLUSION 49

Cases Cited

	PAGE
Aero Design v. Oklahoma, 151 F. Supp. 844, affirmed 353 U. S. 943, 77 S. Ct. 824	49
Bender v. Board of Regents, 262 A. D. 627, 30 N. Y. S. 2d 779	16, 18, 19
Carter v. Carter Coal Company, 298 U. S. 238, 56 S. Ct. 855	20, 26, 49
Cella v. U. S., 208 F. 2d 783, cert. den. 347 U. S. 1016, 74 S. Ct. 864	49
Chicago, etc. v. Chicago, 166 U. S. 226	39
Connally v. General Construction Company, 269 U. S. 385, 46 S. Ct. 126	34
Cosmopolitan v. Feuchtwanger, 226 N. Y. S. 2d 584	29
Dejonge v. State of Oregon, 299 U. S. 353, 57 S. Ct. 255	28
Donegan, In re, 282 N. Y. 285	33, 37, 45
Epstein, Application of, 267 A. D. 27, 44 N. Y. S. 2d 921	19
Fay v. State of New York, 332 U. S. 261, 67 S. Ct. 1613	14
Fink v. Cole, 302 N. Y. 216	25, 39
Genova v. Board of Regents, 272 A. D. 1085, 74 N. Y. S. 2d 729	15n
Gooch v. U. S., 297 U. S. 124, 56 S. Ct. 395	37
Hecht v. Monaghan, 307 N. Y. 461	18, 20, 21
Hilfer v. Board of Regents, 283 N. Y. 304	16, 34, 36, 44, 45
Honeyman v. Hanan, 300 U. S. 14, 57 S. Ct. 350, 81 L. Ed. 476	12
Hopt v. Utah, 110 U. S. 574	30
Inland Steel Co. v. National Labor Relations Board, 109 F. 2d 9	21
Irvin v. Dowd, 359 U. S. 394, 79 S. Ct. 825	15

PAGE

Jordan v. Massachusetts, 225 U. S. 167, 32 S. Ct. 651 21
Julien J. Studley v. Geisenger, 12 Misc. 2d 527, 177 N. Y. S. 2d 776, affirmed 7 A. D. 2d 844, 182 N. Y. S. 2d 326 38
Juno Operating Corp. v. New York City Police Department, 199 N. Y. S. 2d 267 ..... 15n

Lanza v. State of New York, 82 S. Ct. 1218 12
Lanzetta v. New Jersey, 306 U. S. 451, 59 S. Ct. 618 ..... 28, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40
Lewis v. Johnson, 16 F. 2d 180 32
Lloyd, etc. v. Elting, 287 U. S. 329, 53 S. Ct. 167 ..... 31, 32

Marburg v. Cole, 286 N. Y. 202 33
Morgan v. U. S., 298 U. S. 468, 56 S. Ct. 906 ..... 21, 32
Morhous v. Supreme Court of New York, 293 N. Y. 131 15

Neal v. Delaware, 103 U. S. 370 ..... 15n

O'Dea's Bar & Restaurant, Inc. v. New York State Liquor Authority, 201 N. Y. S. 2d 340 ..... 32, 33
Olsen v. Olsen, 27 Misc. 2d 555, 209 N. Y. S. 2d 503 .. 38

Packer Collegiate Institute v. University of State of New York, 298 N. Y. 184 ..... 39, 42
Panama Refining Co. v. Ryan, 293 U. S. 388, 55 S. Ct. 241 39
People v. Bene, 288 N. Y. 318 ..... 34, 37
People v. Grundstein, 245 N. Y. S. 523 45
People v. Glubo, 5 N. Y. 2d 461, 186 N. Y. S. 2d 26 ... 38
People v. Kendricks, 300 N. Y. 544 23
People v. Kightlinger, 89 N. Y. S. 2d 755, modified 93 N. Y. S. 2d 636, affirmed without opinion, 301 N. Y. 639 ..... 37, 45
People v. Levy, 128 N. Y. S. 2d 275, 283 A. D. 383 .... 34, 37
People v. Shapiro, 4 N. Y. 2d 597, 176 N. Y. S. 2d 632 ..... 38, 45

PAGE

Pierre v. State of Louisiana, 306 U. S. 354, 59 S. Ct. 536 ..... 13, 14
Powell v. Alabama, 287 U. S. 45, 53 S. Ct. 55 48
Ray v. Board of Regents, 9 A. D. 2d 560, 189 N. Y. S. 2d 299 ..... 15n
Schechter Poultry Corp. v. U. S., 295 U. S. 495, 55 S. Ct. 837 ..... 26, 39, 43
Sims v. U. S., 252 F. 2d 434, affirmed 359 U. S. 108, 79 S. Ct. 641 14
Small v. Moss, 279 N. Y. 288 ..... 39, 42
Smigel v. Board of Regents, 15 A. D. 2d 623, 222 N. Y. S. 2d 457 ..... 15n
Snyder v. Massachusetts, 291 U. S. 97, 54 S. Ct. 330 23
Stammer v. Board of Regents, 262 A. D. 372, 29 N. Y. S. 2d 38 21
Stuart v. Palmer, 74 N. Y. 183 43
Titus v. Wallick, 306 U. S. 282, 59 S. Ct. 557 13
Tompkins v. Board of Regents, 299 N. Y. 469 ..... 15n
Truax v. Corrigan, 257 U. S. 312 49
Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U. S. 510 20
U. S. v. Eaton, 144 U. S. 677, 27 S. Ct. 764 ..... 27, 39

Laws

Constitution of U. S.—Amendment 14 ..... 3, 14
Constitution of U. S.—Amendment 14, § 1 4
28 U. S. C. 1257(3) 2
Civil Practice Act of the State of N. Y. Article 78 7
N. Y. State Education Law, § 211 ..... 3, 4, 42
N. Y. State Education Law, § 6501, subd. 4 ..... 4, 26, 35, 39
N. Y. State Education Law, § 6514 ..... 9, 22, 24, 43
N. Y. State Education Law, § 6514 2(a) 4, 6, 10, 26, 27, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40
N. Y. State Education Law, § 6514 2(g) 4, 6, 10, 12, 26, 27, 29, 30, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40
N. Y. State Education Law, § 6515 ..... 2, 4, 9, 10, 22, 24, 25, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1962

No.

DAVID WASSERMANN,

Petitioner,

against

THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE APPELLATE DIVISION, THIRD DEPARTMENT, OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

To the Supreme Court of the United States:

Petitioner prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to the Appellate Division, Third Department, of the Supreme Court of the State of New York to review the judgment of the New York State Court of Appeals, entered in the above entitled case on April 5, 1962, and the said Appellate Division's order, entered May 16, 1962, which made the said Court of Appeals judgment the order of the said Appellate Division.

Opinions Below

The opinion of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York is unreported as yet. It is set forth herein in the appendix, at page 1a.